

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

**INSTITUTE FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION**

11250 WAPLES MILL ROAD

FAIRFAX, VIRGINIA 22030



**NRA**

March 14, 2022

Joint Committee on the Judiciary  
Legislative Office Building  
300 Capitol Avenue  
Hartford, CT 06106

Dear Senator Winfield, Representative Stafstrom and distinguished members of the Committee:

On behalf of the members of the National Rifle Association in Connecticut, I would like to communicate our positions on several pieces of legislation that are before the Joint Committee on the Judiciary.

I would respectfully urge the committee to support S.B. 388, H.B. 5412 and H.B. 5415 and to oppose S.B.16 and H.B. 5416.

[S.B. 388 – an act concerning the defense of a person or a person’s dwelling, place of work or motor vehicle](#)

[H.B. 5412 – an act concerning the duty to retreat in a religious house of worship](#)

S.B. 388 and H.B. 5412 both strengthen Connecticut’s self-defense laws. S.B. 388 creates a presumption that it is reasonable to believe deadly physical force is necessary to defend oneself or another person, who is unlawfully entered someone’s dwelling, place of work or motor vehicle. H.B. 5412 removes the duty to retreat for an individual who uses deadly physical force to defend himself or another person within a house of religious worship.

If enacted, both pieces of legislation place the risk of initiating a criminal assault or other attack back on the criminal aggressor, and ensures that victims of crime who respond with appropriate defensive force while protecting themselves or their loved ones will not have to face the additional threat of criminal or civil prosecution.

Expecting the police to prevent all crime is neither practically nor legally justified. Courts have consistently ruled that law enforcement officers have no enforceable obligation to protect individuals, as the judges observed in the case of *Warren v. District of Columbia* (1981): “Courts have without exception concluded that when a municipality or other government entity undertakes to provide public services, it assumed a duty only to the public at large, and not to the individual members of the community.”

[H.B. 5415 – an act concerning the transfer of assault weapons and large capacity magazines](#)

H.B. 5415 allows the legal transfer of so-called “assault weapons” and “large capacity magazines” between people who already legally possess such weapons or magazines. If an individual lawfully possesses a firearm or magazine, it would follow that the individual should be able to lawfully transfer this property to another person who can lawfully own or possess the firearm or magazine.

#### [S.B. 16 – an act addressing gun violence and juvenile crime](#)

S.B. 16 is an omnibus gun control bill that seeks to make several changes to Connecticut statute. Most notably, the bill expands Connecticut’s so-called “assault weapons ban”, modifies carry laws, and expands gun free zones. This legislation is a direct attack on the Second Amendment and the fundamental rights of law-abiding Connecticut citizens.

Expanding the “assault weapons ban” attempts to address a problem which doesn’t exist. According to FBI Uniform Crime Reports, the nation’s total violent crime rate peaked in 1991 and declined to near historic lows over the next two decades. At the same time, according to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, the number of the most popular firearm classified in this legislation as a so-called “assault weapon”, the AR-15 semiautomatic rifle grew from only a few hundred thousand to many millions, making it one of the most popular firearms in America.

The bill also requires law-abiding citizens with a handgun carry permit to present the permit to law enforcement upon request, even if law enforcement has no reasonable suspicion of a crime. The Fourth Amendment allows police to stop and briefly detain a person to investigate only if the officer has a reasonable suspicion, supported by articulable facts that criminal activity is occurring. This is why Connecticut law requires that officers must have a “reasonable suspicion” that a crime is being committed before they may request proof of a permit.

Lastly, this bill seeks to expand the list of gun free zones in Connecticut. This is an attack on the right to self-defense for Connecticut citizens and gun owners. Expanding gun free zones will not enhance public safety. Gun free zones are created and enforced with nothing more than a sheet of paper, and have never stopped a criminal act. To the contrary, one might argue that these areas invite criminal activity rather than discouraging it.

#### [H.B. 5416 – an act concerning bulk purchases of pistols and revolvers](#)

This bill rations the Second Amendment rights of citizens by prohibiting the purchase, delivery or transfer of more than one pistol or revolver to any individual during a thirty-day period, with limited exceptions. We oppose one-gun-a-month schemes that would restrict law-abiding citizens from exercising their Second Amendment Rights more than once a month. This type of legislation is not “good” legislation and will not help to get illegal guns off of our streets. It will only serve as a roadblock to the legal purchase of a firearm by the law-abiding citizens of Connecticut and those seeking to limit gun owners to one gun a month, will seek one every two months or even a year in the future because their ultimate goal is to stop law-abiding Americans from exercising their Second Amendment rights.

These proposals are also superfoulous in light of existing federal law; regulations instituted by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (BATFE) require licensed firearms dealers to file "Multiple Purchase Reporting Forms" with the agency to document the sale to an individual of more than one handgun in a 5-day period. Furthermore, one-gun-a-month regulations would have no effect whatsoever on those cases in which an ineligible person needs only one firearm with which to commit a crime.

On behalf of the thousands of NRA members in Connecticut, I strongly urge the committee to support S.B. 388, H.B. 5412, H.B.5415 and oppose S.B. 16 and H.B. 5416. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have additional questions or concerns at [llepage@nrahq.org](mailto:llepage@nrahq.org).

Sincerely,



Lauren E. LePage, Esq.  
State Director  
NRA-ILA

